



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/913,695	08/02/2002	Niels Rump	SCH00113	3855
22862 7590 03/18/2010 GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L MENLO PARK, CA 94025				
EXAMINER HENNING, MATTHEW T				
ART UNIT 2431		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/18/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

[eptomatters@glenn-law.com](mailto:eptomatters@glenn-law.com)

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/913,695

**Applicant(s)**

RUMP ET AL.

**Examiner**

MATTHEW T. HENNING

**Art Unit**

2431

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2010.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 9-11, 13, 16 and 17 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 9-11, 13, 16 and 17 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 June 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/C.3)  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

This action is in response to the communication filed on 1/28/2010.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 1/28/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the applicants' argument that neither Saito, Peterson, nor Downs teach processing the information of the header which is not needed to play back the unencrypted start section concurrent with playing back the unencrypted start section, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case, it is the combination of Saito, Peterson, and Downs that renders the claim, and specifically this limitation obvious. The combination of Saito and Peterson teach that the beginning of the user data should be kept unencrypted and is to be used as sample data, which can be played back freely by the user. Saito and Peterson also teach that the remaining data is stored in encrypted form, and once authorized the data may be decrypted for playback. This authorization may have been performed previously, and a record of such is stored indicating as such, as can be seen in Col. 8 Line 66 - Col. 9 Line 35 of Peterson. Downs teaches that while playing back content (i.e. data which has been decrypted), the encrypted portions of the content may be decrypted in order to allow them to be played back with no delay. The ordinary person skilled in the art (note that the level of skill in the art of data security is very high), when

1 considering these teachings, would conclude that while the beginning sample data is being  
2 played back, the remaining encrypted data can be decrypted for play back as well. The ordinary  
3 person skilled in the art would also realize that the portion of the header data needed to recognize  
4 the encrypted data would be processed during the decryption process, and as such would be  
5 processed during the playback of the unencrypted sample data. As such, the ordinary person  
6 skilled in the art would have found the claim limitations obvious in light of the Saito, Peterson,  
7 and Downs teachings. Therefore, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

8         Regarding the applicant's argument that in Peterson "any non-encrypted video data...is  
9 finally processed...so that the consumer can access and view the trailer and instructions but not  
10 the actual movie", the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. In Peterson, "the  
11 reader...processes the data stream to generate appropriate analog video signals at its output,  
12 thereby allowing the consumer to access and view the trailer and **instructions**". If the consumer  
13 wishes to view the encrypted data, the user indicates this desire at which point it is determined  
14 whether or not the consumer is already authorized to view the encrypted data. In the event that  
15 the user is already authorized to view the encrypted data, the processor proceeds with the  
16 decryption process, as can be seen in Col. 8 Line 66 - Col. 9 Line 35. The applicant has  
17 appeared to have completely ignored the fact that Peterson teaches that the authorization could  
18 have already been performed prior to playing the unencrypted sample section, in his remarks. As  
19 such, the examiner does not find the applicant's argument persuasive.

20         Regarding the applicant's argument that Peterson teaches "that in a first step, the  
21 unencrypted start section is replayed and nothing else is done, and in a second step, which is only  
22 initiated when the user desires to watch the whole movie, authorizations and key transmission

1 messages are performed to finally decrypt the encrypted part of the movie", the examiner does  
2 not find the argument persuasive. In this case, the examiner can find no teaching in Peterson that  
3 while the unencrypted sample is being played "nothing else is done". Furthermore, the applicant  
4 has failed to point out the particular section of Peterson which specifically teaches that nothing  
5 else is done during playback of the sample. Therefore, the examiner does not find the argument  
6 persuasive.

7       Regarding the applicant's argument that Downs teaches that only previously encrypted  
8 data being played back allows concurrent decryption of encrypted data, and therefore in the  
9 combination with Saito and Peterson, the teachings of Downs would only apply to the playback  
10 of the encrypted content, and not playback of the unencrypted sample section, the examiner does  
11 not find the argument persuasive. While Downs preferred embodiment involves a first section of  
12 encrypted data being decrypted, and during playback of said decrypted section, the next  
13 encrypted section is decrypted, the teachings of Downs in no way limit themselves to only that  
14 embodiment. For example, Downs states "Although a specific embodiment of the invention has  
15 been disclosed, it will be understood by those having skill in the art that changes can be made to  
16 this specific embodiment without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention. The scope  
17 of the invention is not to be restricted, therefore, to the specific embodiment, and it is intended  
18 that the appended claims cover any and all such applications, modifications, and embodiments  
19 within the scope of the present invention." When confronted with teachings of a system which  
20 decrypts a section of content, plays back the content which is now unencrypted, and decrypts the  
21 next sections concurrently with the playback of the unencrypted section, the ordinary person of  
22 skill in the art, who is also of ordinary creativity in the art, would readily recognize that whether

1 the first section was encrypted or not is irrelevant, but that the overall teaching of this section of  
2 Downs is that while content is being played back, encrypted content which is next to be played  
3 back can be decrypted such that it is ready for playback by the time the previous section is  
4 finished being played back. As such, in considering the teachings of Saito and Peterson, in light  
5 of the teachings of Downs, the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to  
6 begin decryption of the encrypted sections of content during playback of the unencrypted sample  
7 section in the event that the authorization had previously been performed. This would have been  
8 obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to prevent  
9 delay of playback of the movie upon command to have do so. Furthermore, there is nothing in  
10 the teachings of Peterson that the user is limited from indicating desire of playback of the movie  
11 during the playback of the sample content. Therefore, the examiner does not find the argument  
12 persuasive.

13 Regarding the applicant's argument that Downs does not teach concurrently decrypting  
14 the data while playing back unencrypted data, the examiner does not find the argument  
15 persuasive. The applicant's argument is tantamount to saying that cleartext data derived from  
16 decrypting encrypted data does not fall within the scope of unencrypted data. The examiner  
17 completely disagrees with this argument. Downs teaches playing back data which has been  
18 decrypted, while concurrently decrypting the next data to be played back. Data which has been  
19 decrypted becomes unencrypted data. Therefore, the examiner does not find the argument  
20 persuasive.

21 Regarding the applicant's argument that the claim language does not recite that a  
22 decryption is performed concurrently with the playing back of the unencrypted start section but

1 the passage explicitly states that the information of the header, which is not needed to play back  
2 the unencrypted start section is performed concurrently with playing back, the examiner does not  
3 find the argument persuasive. While the examiner agrees with the applicants interpretation of  
4 the claim language, the examiner points out that it is not the decryption alone which is being  
5 relied upon in meeting this limitation, but rather it is the processing of the portion of the header  
6 data needed to recognize the encrypted data in order to allow the decryption of the encrypted  
7 data to occur, and as such would be processed during the playback of the unencrypted sample  
8 data. This is suggested in the teachings of Saito Col. 8 Paragraphs 1-2. Furthermore, as taught  
9 by Peterson, the time limit and usage limit, which are both shown to be header data in Fig. 3, are  
10 processed in order to determine whether to allow playback of the encrypted content, as can be  
11 seen in Col. 8 Line 66 - Col. 9 Line 35. Therefore, in the combination of Saito, Peterson, and  
12 Downs, in the case that authentication data exists already for the encrypted content, while the  
13 sample data is being played, the encrypted content would be decrypted as taught by Downs.  
14 Further, in this combination, in order for the encrypted content to be decrypted, as taught by  
15 Peterson, the time limits and usage limits must be checked. This involves processing "header  
16 data which is not needed to play back the unencrypted start section". Further, the examiner  
17 points out that this would increase the efficiency of the playback of the encrypted content  
18 because it would be decrypted by the time that the sample data was finished playing back, or by  
19 the time the user indicated that full playback was desired. Therefore, the examiner does not find  
20 the argument persuasive.

21 Regarding the applicant's argument that it would not make sense to process the header  
22 data related to the encrypted data during playback of the unencrypted portion because "it can

1 easily be the case that after ordering the full movie, the time limit is such that the user is only  
2 allowed to view the movie on day later or so...therefore, the delay as set by the ordering  
3 procedure in Peterson is so significant that any motivation to increase efficiency before one  
4 knows that the user is indeed interested in the whole movie is not at all an issue, the examiner  
5 does not find the argument persuasive. First, the examiner points out that in the combination  
6 relied upon, the ordering procedure has already been accomplished prior to playing back the  
7 unencrypted data. Second, the examiner does not see how the length indicated by the time limit  
8 has anything to do with whether one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to increase  
9 the efficiency of playback of the content. As such, the examiner does not find the argument  
10 persuasive.

11       Regarding the applicant's argument that "the no delay feature is not motivation derived  
12 from any of the three cited references", the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be  
13 established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed  
14 invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the  
15 references themselves **or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the**  
16 **art.** See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958  
17 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the teachings of Downs shows that the  
18 use of concurrent playback and decryption processing allows for no delay in the playback of the  
19 content. Eliminating delay in processing is a desirable feature in the art of decryption, and  
20 therefore would provide appropriate motivation to the ordinary person skilled in the art to  
21 employ the teachings of Downs in a decryption system.

1           Regarding the applicant's argument that one would not have any interest in decrypting  
2     the encrypted data for playback, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. The entire  
3     purpose of Saito is to allow the encrypted data to be secure but decryptable. Peterson further  
4     provides a system where encrypted content is decrypted. Further, the teachings of Downs is  
5     related to decrypting encrypted content. Clearly, there is desire in the art to decrypt encrypted  
6     content. Therefore, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

7           Regarding the applicant's argument that in the combination, the content would only be  
8     decrypted in the event that the user presses appropriate key to indicate his desire to consume the  
9     encrypted content, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. First of all, Peterson  
10    does not limit such a depressing to only after the sample data has been fully played back. Rather,  
11    as would be recognized by the ordinary person of skill in the art, the user could indicate the  
12    desire to playback the entirety of the content during the playback of the sample content. In such  
13    a case, as the ordinary person of skill would recognize, it would have been desirable to have  
14    already begun decryption prior to the user indicating desire to watch the movie such that there is  
15    no delay in the playback which would be incurred if decryption was still necessary. However,  
16    whether the user indicates desire for full playback during or after the playback of the sample data  
17    is besides the point. Even in the event that desire of full playback was not indicated until after  
18    the sample data had completed its playback, delay in playback is still avoided by beginning  
19    decryption of the full content during playback of the sample content, as would have been  
20    recognized by the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention in light of the  
21    teachings of Downs. As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

Regarding the applicant's argument that the examiner has provided no evidence for stating on page 2 lines 20-22 that "'the ordinary person skilled in the art would realize' anything", the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. First, the examiner has not made such a general allegation in the quoted paragraph. Instead, the examiner has stated that "the ordinary person skilled in the art would also realize that the portion of the header data needed to recognize the encrypted data would be processed during the decryption process." As I have shown above, this is supported by the teachings of Saito. Furthermore, the examiner reminds the applicant that what the ordinary person skilled in the art would find obvious is not limited only to the printed teachings which he is reading, but also to the general knowledge in the art, as well as logical reasoning. As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive.

Because the examiner does not find the arguments persuasive, the examiner has maintained the rejections presented below.

All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

Claims 6, 9-11, 13, 16, and 17 have been examined.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

1           Claims 6, 10, 11, 13, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable  
2   over Saito (US Patent Number 6,744,894), and further in view of Peterson, Jr. (US Patent  
3   Number 5,825,876) hereinafter referred to as Peterson, and further in view of Downs et al. (US  
4   Patent Number 6,226,618).

5           Regarding claim 6, Saito disclosed a method for playing back an encrypted user data  
6   stream, which has a header and a user data block (See Saito Fig. 4G), where an unencrypted start  
7   section of the user data block comprises a first part of the user data in an unencrypted form (See  
8   Saito Fig. 4G and Col. 8 Paragraphs 6-10) and where a further section of the user data block  
9   comprises a second part of the user data in an encrypted form (See Saito Fig. 4G), and appending  
10   the encrypted user data to the unencrypted start section (See Saito Fig. 4G), where the header  
11   comprises information which is absolutely necessary for playing back the unencrypted start  
12   section of the user data block and where the header also comprises information which is not  
13   needed to play back the unencrypted start section of the user data block (See Saito Fig. 4G and  
14   Col. 8), processing the information of the header which is not needed to play back the  
15   unencrypted start section (See Saito Col. 8 Paragraphs 2-10); and decrypting the further section  
16   of the user data block using the information of the header which is processed in the step of  
17   processing (See Saito Col. 8 Paragraphs 2-10); but Saito failed to disclose using the first part of  
18   the user data as the unencrypted start section; for playback, initially processing only the  
19   information of the header which is absolutely necessary for playing back the unencrypted start  
20   section of the user data block; and playing back the unencrypted start section of the user data  
21   block, or that the step of processing the information of the header which is not needed to play

back the unencrypted start section is performed concurrently with the playing back of the unencrypted start section.

Peterson teaches providing non-secured content data along with the secured content data, the non-secured content data constituting a free sampling of the secured data, as it may be readily accessed, without authorization, by a potential consumer and is provided as a means for enticing the consumer to pay for access to the secured data content (See Peterson Col. 5 Lines 30-39). Peterson further teaches that the non-secure data is the first part of the content data and that it immediately follows the header data (See Peterson Fig. 3). Peterson further teaches initially processing only the information of the header which is absolutely necessary for playing back the sample data (Peterson Col. 7 Line 56 – Col. 8 Line 12).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to have employed the teachings of Peterson in the content system of Saito by providing non-secured sampling data immediately following the header data and before the secured data and by initially processing only the header data necessary to play back the sampling data. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to provide a means for enticing the consumer to pay for access to the secured content.

Downs teaches that concurrently decrypting the data while playing back unencrypted data makes the decryption more efficient since the entire file does not need to be decrypted prior to beginning playback (See Downs Col. 82 Paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to employ the teachings of Downs in the decryption system of Saito and Peterson by

1 concurrently playing and decrypting. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person  
2 skilled in the art would have been motivated to increase the efficiency of the decryption system.

3 In this combination, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art  
4 at the time of invention that while the initial sample data is being played back, the first portion of  
5 encrypted data would be decrypted, as taught by Downs, in order to allow the content playback  
6 to be streamed from the file.

7 Regarding claim 13, Saito, Peterson, and Downs disclosed a method for playing back an  
8 encrypted multimedia data stream, which has a header and a user data block, where an  
9 unencrypted start section of the user data block, which is placed immediately after the header,  
10 comprises the first part of the user data in an unencrypted form and where a further section of the  
11 user data block comprises a second part of the user data in an encrypted form, where the header  
12 comprises information which is absolutely necessary for playing back the unencrypted start  
13 section of the user data block and where the header also comprises information which is not  
14 needed to play back the unencrypted start section of the user data block (See Saito Fig. 4G and  
15 Col. 8), comprising the following steps: initially processing the information of the header which  
16 is absolutely necessary for playing back the unencrypted start section of the user data block (See  
17 Saito Col. 8 Paragraph 2), processing the information of the header which is not needed to play  
18 back the unencrypted start section (See Saito Col. 8 Paragraph 2 and Peterson Col. 7 Line 56 –  
19 Col. 8 Line 12); and decrypting the further section of the user data block using the information of  
20 the header which is processed by the unit for processing (See Saito Col. 8 Paragraphs 2-10);  
21 wherein the processing the information of the header which is not needed to play back the  
22 unencrypted start section is designed to be operated concurrently to the playing back the

unencrypted start section (See Downs Col. 82 Paragraph 6 and the rejection of claim 6 above); but failed to disclose specifically playing back the data. However, it is implied that the data was meant to be played back since Saito disclosed that the data was video data (See Saito Col. 8 Paragraph 2), and it was further obvious that playback would have been in response to processing the header data (used to allow the content to be recognized, as seen in Saito Col. 8). Saito further did not specifically disclose a unit which only processes the header. However, it was well known in the art that modularization of a system improved the flexibility and comprehensibility of the system, and as such it would have been obvious to have broken the system in to different modules, and as header processors were also well known in the art it would have been obvious to have used a dedicated header processor in the system of Saito.

Regarding claim 10, Saito, Peterson, and Downs disclosed that the data was encoded (See Saito Col. 2 Paragraph 2) and it therefore would have been obvious that the type of coding was indicated in the header data in order to recognize the data.

Regarding claim 11 and 17, Saito, Peterson, and Downs taught that the user data are audio and/or video data (Saito Col. 8 Lines 6-19).

Claims 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito, Peterson, and Downs as applied to claims 6 and 13 above, and further in view of Rump et al. (DE 196 25 635 C1).

While Saito, Peterson, and Downs generically taught having unencrypted sample data, Saito and Peterson did not teach a length for the sample data, specifically that the length of the unencrypted start section of the user data block is between 1 and 60 seconds.

Rump, on the other hand, teaches specifically that the first 20 seconds of an audio track can be used as sample data (Rump Col. 2 Last Paragraph to Col. 3 First paragraph).

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention to have employed the teachings of Rump in the content system of Saito, Peterson, and Downs by having the sample data be the first 20 seconds of an audio track. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to provide a specific sample size to the generic sample data of Saito and Peterson.

#### ***Conclusion***

Claims 6, 9-11, 13, 16, and 17 have been rejected.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

1 will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR  
2 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however,  
3 will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this  
4 final action.

5 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the  
6 examiner should be directed to MATTHEW T. HENNING whose telephone number is  
7 (571)272-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

8 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's  
9 supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571)272-7589. The fax phone number for the  
10 organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

11 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent  
12 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications  
13 may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished  
14 applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR  
15 system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR  
16 system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would  
17 like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated  
18 information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

19  
20  
21 /Matthew T Henning/  
22 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431  
23